UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,606	06/12/2007	Mark Baijens	PC10915US	1663
23122 RATNERPRES	7590 10/08/200 STIA	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 980	CE DA 10402	MUSTAFA, IMRAN K		
VALLEY FOR	GE, PA 19482		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/593,606	BAIJENS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
IMRAN MUSTAFA	3663	

	IMRAN MUSTAFA	3663	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THI			adamment of this
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 	-	n the final rejection, which	chever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	•	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u> 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment of the	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	lucing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:, (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> .		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>11,13,17-22,24 and 25</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>NONE</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Jack W. Keith/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3663			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Engelman in view of Russell clearly disclose the claimed invention.

On page 5 of the applicant's response applicants argue that Russell and Engelman are not concerned with single track vehicles.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments because Russell clearly discloses that the system can be used in a single track vehicle (Column 3 lines 10-18 "vehicle 10 is shown as an automobile, however the presently disclosed invention could be used with any other type of vehicle such as a motorcycle")

On page 5 of the applicant's argument applicants argue that Russell does not disclose on vehicle acceleration and deceleration.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments. Russell clearly discloses of vehicle acceleration and deceleration (Column 5 lines 13-25, Column 4 lines 12-25 "with the safe trailing distance determined, the sensor adjusts the accelerator of the trailing vehicle to keep the safe trailing distance maintained between itself and the lad vehicle, Thi9s is done automatically or dynamically, so that the driver input is reduced or removed. For example, if the trialing vehicle were traveling on a highway and has its cruise control set at 65 miles per hour, and a vehicle changes lanes in front of the driver, the accelerator is dynamically controlled to permit a safe traveling distance between the trailing vehicle and the lead vehicle"). Thus it is clear from Russell's disclosure that he does indeed disclose of acceleration and deceleration in order to maintain a safe traveling distance to the lead vehicle.

On page 5 of the applicant's arguments applicant's argue that Engelman does not teach actuating a vehicle acceleration controller according to a current engine driving torque.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments. Engelman clearly discloses of a longitudinal controller that actuates the vehicle acceleration controller according to an engine torque (Column 3 lines 39-47 "vehicle propelled by an internal combustion engine may have an electronic throttle control that control the amount off engine throttle opening to thereby apply corresponding torque through a drivertrain of the vehicle")